

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 158-173 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 158-159 and 166-167 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kurematsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,153,752 (“KUREMATSU”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. KUREMATSU Failed to Disclose or Suggest Multiple Elements Recited in the Rejected Independent Claims

1. Claim 158

Claim 158 recites a method of producing a modulated beam of light suitable for projection of video image comprising steps [a]-[e]. The Examiner cited Figure 2 in KUREMATSU for allegedly disclosing these steps.

Specifically, in claim 158, element [d] recites “combining altered separated beams of color into a single collinear color beam ...” and element [e] recites “resolving from the single collinear color beam a first resolved color beam ... and a second resolved color beam” As will be shown below, KUREMATSU fails to disclose or suggest at least steps [d] and [e] as recited in claim 158.

a. KUREMATSU Does Not Disclose Step [d]

In Figure 2 of KUREMATSU, “reflected image light components” are combined by the first to fourth dichroic mirrors (24a-24d) into two separate beams of combined light to be resolved by two separate beam splitters (21 and 23). KUREMATSU, col. 7, lines 30-31.

At this time, the synthetic light which was synthesized by the first and second dichroic

mirrors 24a and 24b (the first beam of combined light) is again led to the polarizing beam splitter 23. The synthetic light which was synthesized by the third and fourth dichroic mirrors 24c and 24d (the second beam of combined light) is again led to the polarizing beam splitter 21. KUREMATSU, col. 7, lines 31-37 (emphasis added).

In contrast, step [d] of claim 158 recites “combining altered separated beams of color into a single collinear color beam ...” Based on the foregoing, KUREMATSU does not disclose or suggest at least step [d] of claim 158 and this claim should be in condition for allowance.

b. KUREMATSU Does Not Disclose Step [e]

In KUREMATSU, the two separate combined beams of light are resolved by two separate beam splitters (21 & 23) into four resolved beams. KUREMATSU, col. 7, lines 31-48.

In contrast, step [e] of claim 158 recites “resolving from the single collinear color beam a first resolved color beam ... and a second resolved color beam” Thus, KUREMATSU also does not disclose or suggest step [e] of claim 158 and this claim should be in condition for allowance.

2. Independent Claim 166

Independent claim 166 recites substantially the same limitations as claim 158 as discussed above. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to claim 158, claim 166 should also be in condition for allowance.

3. Dependent Claims 159-165 & 167-173

Dependent claims 159-165 & 167-173 are dependent on independent claims 158 & 166, respectively. Based on the foregoing arguments with respect to the independent claims, these dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Dependent claims 160, 163, 168 and 171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KUREMATSU in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 ("KONNO"). Dependent claims 161-162, 164-165, 169-170, and 172-173 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KUREMATSU in view of KONNO, and further in view of Ooi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,245,449.


Based on the foregoing arguments regarding independent claims 158 and 166, Applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections are now moot and these dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

Law Office of Roxana H. Yang
P.O. Box 400
Los Altos, CA 94023
(650) 948-0822